

## Rollins College Rollins Scholarship Online

---

College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes

College of Arts and Sciences Minutes

---

10-14-2008

# Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Tuesday, Oct. 14, 2008

Arts & Sciences Faculty

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac)



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Tuesday, Oct. 14, 2008" (2008). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 47.

[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac/47](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/47)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [wzhang@rollins.edu](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

**Approved Minutes**  
**Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting**  
**Tuesday, October 14, 2008**

**Members Present:**

Vidhu Aggarwal, Barry Allen, Joshua Almond, Mark Anderson, Gabriel Barreneche, Pedro Bernal, Bill Boles, Rick Bommelje, Dexter Boniface, Wendy Brandon, Sharon Carnahan, Julie Carrington, Roger Casey, Julian Chambliss, David Charles, Martha Chen, Doug Child, Ed Cohen, Mario D'Amato, Alice Davidson, Don Davison, Joan Davison, Nancy Decker, Kimberly Dennis, Rosana Diaz-Zambrana, Jalh Dulanto, Lewis Duncan, James Eck, Nicola Edwards, Marty Farkash, Michael Furlong, Laurel Goj, Elton Graugnard, Yudit Greenberg, Mike Gunter, Dana Hargrove, Karen Hater, Scott Hewit, Gordie Howell, Richard James, Laurie Joyner, Ashley Kistler, Steve Klemann, Philip Kozel, Carol Lauer, Barry Levis, Richard Lewin, Susan Libby, Lee Lines, Dorothy Mays, Edna McClellan, Al Moe, Bob Moore, Thom Moore, Ryan Musgrave, Rachel Newcomb, Kathryn Norsworthy, Thomas Ouellette, Alberto Prieto-Calixto, Jennifer Queen, Dawn Roe, Sigmund Rothschild, Emily Russell, Marc Sardy, John Sinclair, Jim Small, Paul Stephenson, Darren Stoub, Claire Strom, Kathryn Sutherland, Bill Svitavsky, Mary Throumoulos, Lisa Tillmann, Patricia Tome, Robert Vander Poppen, Martina Vidovic, Rick Vitray, Tonia Warnecke, Debra Wellman, Yusheng Yao, Jay Yellen,

Guests: Ed Huffman, Sharon Agee, Sharon Carrier, Micki Meyer, Marissa Germain

- I. Call to Order—Davison called the meeting to order at 12:40 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes –The minutes of the September 23 meeting of the faculty were approved.
- III. Old Business  
  
None
- IV. New Business



1. Merit Proposal—Davison summarized the events leading to the proposal to be placed before the faculty. The Trustees have approved two pots of money for the traditional salary increase and the other for merit. Half of that pot went to cover historically unrewarded merit. The rest will go to merit increases if the faculty approves the merit proposal. Otherwise the funds will go to other uses. The protocol was designed by the faculty task force. James moved the protocol. Klemann seconded the motion. James presented the protocol. (see

attachment 1). The new FSAR will be used to collect information. The dean of the faculty will review them along with the Faculty Salary Council who will work with the Dean especially with the outliers. The appeal process will be handled by an appeals subcommittee of PSC. James reported that the criteria were most difficult to agree upon. The task force decided to use the description in the Faculty Handbook which work for tenure and promotion and will now be used for merit increases. The Dean and the Faculty Salary Council committee will present cumulative report information each year to the faculty especially information about the outliers. The Task Force Committee had used a series of grounding principles and assumptions. (see attachment 2). James thanked those who had worked on the protocol. Harris stated that he approved of the proposal but asked if FSAR replaced the AFAR. James said that the new form was designed to be comprehensive. Carnahan said that the original document presented to the faculty gave departments a great deal of authority in the process but the new proposal gives no authority to the departments. She also asked what happened to the money if the threshold was not met. Lines thought that because faculty were doing so many diverse activities that it would become a nightmare to look through the lens of departments and that it must be the eye of the college for a while. The process could be come divisive within a department and therefore it was better handled at the college level. Joyner added that money left over if the threshold was not met would be distributed through the traditional increase. Dennis asked who would decide the issues of the threshold. James said that the Faculty Salary Committee and the Executive Committee would. Joyner said that this process would shift the timetable for salary letters. Staub asked if FSAR would still be

submitted if no money was available; Joyner said yes. Davison said that faculty would have to submit FSAR if they want any other type of grant. Also if money is not sufficient for one year, the Faculty Salary Committee will look back on previous years when there were no grants. Libby asked about transparency and what that meant. James replied that the Dean and FSC will present an annual report to the faculty each year. The report will discuss those who had exceeded expectations. Mays said she really supported this proposal but the librarians find the FSAR not very useful. Was it possible to add an addendum? James said that was always the intent. Warnecke asked about faculty who had to take a leave and salary increments were not added to the base salary. Joyner said that there would be a comprehensive examination every five years to catch anyone who had slipped through. Also the FSAR covers a three-year period. Vitray called the question, which carried. Davison announced that there would be a paper ballot. The proposal passed by a vote of 62 to 12 with two abstentions. Davison thanked the members of the merit task force for their hard work

## V. Reports

### A. Executive Committee

1. Dean of Student Affairs position—Davison reported on discussions about the Dean's position. The Executive Committee had made the following recommendation: the Mission Statement of the Student Affairs division should be revisited during the vacancy to determine how it could best serve the academic mission of the college. Also Hater should be extended for a second year as interim dean while the review of division is undertaken. National search will begin next year, and the Interim dean could apply as a candidate. Vitray asked about the proposed review of the division. Davison said that it would begin shortly. Lines wondered if there was any discussion about the peculiarity of the position. Was there any thought of redefining the position to facilitate a better national search, since last search did not generate a strong pool? Davison said that the Executive Committee had discussed this concern. Boles thought the faculty had conducted a review three years ago. Was that not sufficient? Casey said that review was primarily focused on residential life. What Davison is recommending is of a higher level especially about the relations with the academic. Norsworthy wondered if student affairs representatives would be on the committee. Davison said that the Executive Committee had not progressed that far yet. Casey said that concern about the alignment between student affairs and academics was

crucial. Tillmann was concerned about scapegoating student affairs and that there was a need to have faculty introspection. J. Davison asked if Davison could tell faculty what might be changed in the current mission statement. Davison responded that the concern was about the curriculum and the relation to co-curriculum. There had also been a discussion about residential life and living/learning communities. Carnahan asked about TJs mission. Joyner said it was premature to discuss that at this point but currently services at TJs seem to be working fine.

VI. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 1:28 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis  
Secretary

## Attachment 1

### STRATEGIC FACULTY COMPENSATION IMPLEMENTATION PROTOCOL

***Preamble:*** To implement the Strategic Faculty Compensation System, the Arts and Sciences Faculty will create two entities as oversight mechanisms: the **Faculty Salary Council (FSC)** and the **Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee**. The charge of the FSC is to work in a spirit of collegiality with the Dean of Faculty to ensure the mission and goals of the College are clearly reflected in the criteria used to assess merit across areas of professional responsibility as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The FSC and the Dean of Faculty share responsibility through the process of oversight and review holding each other to the highest standards of fairness, transparency, and accountability. The FSC is a subcommittee of the College of Arts and Sciences whose authority shall be limited to those specified herein. The Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee further guarantees standards of fairness, transparency, and accountability by providing faculty members a process to appeal their merit evaluations on grounds of substance or procedure. The Strategic Faculty Compensations System will begin as a pilot with on-going evaluation by the FSC and reports to Professional Standards Committee.

***Strategic Faculty Compensation Process:***

Each fall the Dean of Faculty will convene a meeting of the FSC to share information regarding the likely size of the total salary raise pool and to seek advice regarding criteria, data sources, and rules of evidence. The FSC will recommend to the Dean that the merit process not be initiated if the merit salary pool does not meet or exceed the minimal amount determined by the A & S Faculty Executive Committee. In addition, the Executive Committee and FSC will guarantee the merit pay system exists in addition to (*not as a substitute for*) the current system of promotion salary adjustments, annual across the board percentage increases to base pay, and equity adjustments. Merit pay will be an increase in the base pay for a faculty member and not treated as a one-time bonus. The FSC will reach agreement with the Dean on the division of the merit salary pool into “Exceeds”, “Meets”, and “Falls Below” amounts. The Dean will not begin the process of evaluating faculty until after the FSC meeting.

The assessment of faculty professional performance for merit purposes begins with the faculty member assessing his or her own performance. The Faculty Self- Assessment Report (FSAR) provides the opportunity for a faculty member to demonstrate how his/her practices and activities meet or exceed professional expectations. The *Faculty Handbook*, Section V, Article VIIIB states the “Criteria for Faculty Evaluation.” While this criterion was established for Tenure and Promotion decisions, the definitions of expectations of Rollins’ faculty in the categories of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service apply to any merit pay evaluations.

The Dean of the Faculty will review each faculty FSAR and rate the faculty member within the categories of *Meets Expectations*, *Exceeds Expectations*, or *Below Expectations* professional expectations. The FSC will review the aggregate results of the Dean's evaluations as well as reach agreement with the Dean on all faculty evaluated as exceeding or below expectations. The FSC will assist the Dean, as necessary, to clarify or validate a specific faculty member's contributions. In addition, the FSC will assist the Dean in making any necessary modifications to the FSAR to improve its utility and to the overall system to better link evaluation to a system of recognition and rewards that most appropriately expresses the value that the College places on its faculty.

**FSC Membership:** Membership of the FSC shall consist of the four elected Division Heads from the College of Arts and Sciences and one tenured faculty member elected by the Executive Committee. If a Division Head is not tenured then the affected Division will elect a tenured faculty member to serve on the FSC. The Chair of the FSC will be elected by the committee from the elected members of the Council. The Dean of the Faculty serves as an *ex-officio* member.

**FSC Implementation Responsibilities:** The FSC will confer with the Dean of the Faculty to clarify the use of evaluation criteria, data sources, and rules of evidence to implement the Strategic Faculty Compensation System. In addition, the FSC will:

- a) review and reach agreement with the Dean on all faculty selected for *Exceeds Expectations* or *Below Expectations* categories;
- b) assist the Dean in the preparation of the annual report on the characteristics of the *Exceeds Expectations* faculty member contributions;
- c) undertake an annual review and recommend changes in all areas related to the salary decision-making process including possible revisions to the FSAR, the procedures for evaluation/review, and the appeals process and make procedural recommendations to the Dean for inclusion in subsequent years; and
- d) work in collaboration with the Dean of the Faculty to continue ongoing discussions and consensus building regarding the values underlying what we consider a productive and contributing faculty member at Rollins College.
- e) review the aggregate outcomes of the merit evaluation process before the final salary decisions are made;
- f) serve as a source of counsel in compensation awards;
- g) advise the Dean of the Faculty in cases where a faculty member believes that the assessment of their contributions is not fair and/or equitable

### ***Strategic Faculty Compensation Appeals Process***

**Membership of Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee:** The faculty salary appeals will be evaluated by a sub-committee of the Professional Standards Committee (PSC). Membership shall consist of four full professors from the A&S Faculty. If the PSC does not have sufficient number of full professors, the faculty will elect subcommittee members from candidates nominated by the Executive Committee. This sub-committee cannot include any members of the FSC. The Merit Pay Appeals Sub-committee should have a gender balance and should represent all four divisions of A&S. The sub-committee members will serve a two-year term.

*Appeal Procedures:* Faculty members will have 14 days after the start of the semester following receipt of his/her salary letter to submit a written request for a re-evaluation. Faculty members may request a meeting with the Dean or the FSC prior to submitting a re-evaluation request to gain insight into the decisions employed in determining the faculty member's merit classification. The faculty member submitting an appeal can select three of the Merit Pay Appeals Sub-committee members to hear his/her case. One of the three will represent the division of the appealing faculty member. The faculty member deserves an expeditious handling of his/her case. The appeals sub-committee must respond to the faculty member within 14 days after receipt of the re-evaluation request. Any adjustments to the faculty member's salary as a result of the appeal process will be made at the same time as other merit adjustments. If warranted, retroactive salary will be provided.



## Attachment 2

### Grounding Assumptions for the Rollins A&S Faculty Strategic Compensation Plan

The grounding assumptions that follow are intended as guiding principles for the establishment and operation of the Faculty Salary Council (FSC) and the Merit Pay Appeals Sub-committee.

- The Faculty Salary Council will work from the assumption that the majority of Rollins faculty are performing at a meritorious level (*i.e.*, meets expectations.)
- Any strategic compensation system must be linked with the College's mission statement.
- As stated in the college by-laws, the primary mission of the institution is teaching.
- The merit pay system will exist in addition to (*not as a substitute for*) the current system of tenure and promotion salary adjustments, annual across-the-board percentage increases to base pay, equity adjustments, and special teaching and service awards.
- The assessment of faculty professional performance for merit purposes begins with the faculty member assessing his or her own performance.
- The FSAR provides the opportunity for a faculty member to demonstrate how their practices and activities meet or exceed professional expectations. The *Faculty Handbook*, Section V, Article VIII B states the "Criteria for Faculty Evaluation". While this criterion was established for Tenure and Promotion decisions, the definitions of expectations of Rollins' faculty in the categories of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service apply to any merit pay evaluations.
- Merit pay will be an increase in the base pay for a faculty member and not treated as a one-time bonus.
- A minimal "trigger" amount for the merit pay pool will be established to ensure that the results of the merit evaluation process will result in "meaningful" increases to faculty salaries. **Evaluations after "lean" years will include a consideration of previously unrecognized meritorious activities.**
- A fair Rollins merit pay system must be simple, streamlined, clear, and transparent.
- The procedure for assessing and awarding merit pay will involve as much faculty input as possible. It will involve as little extra administrative work and bureaucracy as possible.
- A fair Rollins merit pay system will begin as a pilot with on-going evaluation by the FSC.

- In order to support transparency, the Dean of the Faculty and the FSC will provide an annual cumulative report including profiles of faculty, with their approval, deemed to have performed above expectations.